

Comments on June 20, 2013 Planning Commission Agenda

Comments by: Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229). ~~strikeout~~ underline format is used to suggest changes to the passages quoted in *italics*

Item No. 1 Minutes of June 6, 2013

Page 2:

- Line 1: "... and a slide she prepared on behalf of a request by Commissioner ~~Tucker~~ Toerge regarding Ocean Boulevard."
- Paragraph 2: "Discussion followed regarding a budget for the Civic Center and ~~wondered~~ if whether it is not a ~~stand-along~~ stand-alone project with bond monies."
- Paragraph 3: "~~Deputy~~ Public Works Director David Webb reported that..."
- Paragraph 8: "Jim Mosher expressed concern regarding the ability to understand the ~~supporting material~~ relevant law..."
 - [note: I continue to think the state law under which the staff report said the Item 2 hearing was being held – California Government Code Section 65401 – requires an annual General Plan compliance review of **all** planned public works projects within the City, not just the City-funded ones.]

Page 4:

- Paragraph 4: "Jim Mosher addressed specific findings and reported that ~~a~~ the section of the Municipal Code ~~that was~~ under discussion had been recently changed by Council. "

Item No. 2 Recommendation on Residential Lot Mergers (PA2012-102)

In PC 1 (Draft memorandum) --

Page 2 (page 6 of PDF):

- paragraph 2: "... yet could still be ~~in-compatible~~ incompatible with the lots that adjoin it ..."
- paragraph 5: "4. Increased setbacks and floor area restrictions ~~and~~ for merged lots ~~creates~~ create inequities."
- paragraph 6: "Modifying the development standard would ~~create~~ make several existing structures nonconforming." [note: I still don't understand how this would happen if the proposed code change were to affect future mergers only.]
- paragraph 7: I think a fuller explanation of regulation by "lot coverage" is needed. What is it? And how would it negate the effect of increased setbacks?
- In the proposed Recommendation 1, it is unclear if items **a**, **b** and **c** are the *only* matters that may be considered in making the required finding.

Page 3 (page 7 of PDF):

- In Recommendation 2, I believe there was testimony that the Ocean Boulevard lots, before merging, were already larger than most in the area. Were they nonetheless non-conforming in some respect, exempting the merger from further scrutiny under the suggested rule?